



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

well. Nearly all beginners' books, however, decline the singular in three genders throughout, without stating clearly, if at all, that the feminine singular forms are used solely as adjectives. Scientific accuracy, however, demands that we should insist upon the whole truth in this matter. Most of the indefinite pronouns are indispensable to our work of the first year. Such peculiarities as occur in the feminine singular of *aliquis* and such double forms as *quidam* and *quoddam* need to be especially pointed out and explained. Correlative and compound forms need not cause much trouble, if previous declensions have been well mastered.

In the conjugations little can be safely neglected. I should most assuredly omit the future imperatives, though all else is most essential. Special care is due the imperative, infinitive, participial, gerund, gerundive and supine forms. Experience shows that boys and girls enter upon their second year with an exceedingly hazy notion about their formation and inflection. Of irregular verbs only such as do not occur frequently in second year authors should be considered as unessential.

So much, then, for the amount of study of forms upon which we must insist in first year Latin work. Leaving for the present any consideration of the best methods of teaching and learning these inflections, we may now turn to the second topic of our discussion.

(To be continued)

REVIEWS.

A Study in Roman Coins of the Empire. By Fred-eric Stanley Dunn. University of Oregon Bulletin. November, 1909. 23 pp.

Scholars in America have never fully realized the importance of ancient coins as an aid to classical study. It is true, our college texts of ancient authors often have cuts of coins, more or less appropriate, but for the most part derived from old wood-cuts badly drawn and inaccurate in the extreme. It is doubtful in most cases whether the writers have ever seen, or at least examined with care, an original specimen. Nor are they wholly to blame, for their masters and confrères in Europe, with all the great national collections in easy reach and with all the force of centuries of tradition that America lacks, are much in the same position. Archaeology has indeed become a handmaid to classical literature; archaeologists know their literature well, while the exponents of the literature of the Greeks and Romans have become, and are ever becoming more, students of archaeology in every one of its branches—except numismatics. Here, alas! the field is abandoned to dilettanti and specialists outside the universities. Mommsen alone, in this as in other things, stands on a pinnacle by himself. He was the only thoroughly rounded classical scholar. To him no

phase of ancient life and thought, no slightest monument that helps to illustrate the ancient world, was unworthy of the most serious study, and Das Römische Münzwesen testifies to his interest in coins, too, as a subject of historical investigation.

But for the rest,—should we gather the names of great classicists and those of famous numismatists, they would stand in two almost mutually exclusive columns. The study of ancient, especially Roman, coins, has been mainly limited to private collectors—often men with but a meager classical training—and to the custodians of public collections; and scientific articles by competent writers appear almost inevitably in the exclusively numismatic periodicals that seldom reach the greater public, even of the studious. Francesco Gnechi in his valuable little manual *Monete Romane* has drawn up a list of the chief writers on Roman coins from Andrea Fulvio in 1517 to Babelon's *Traité* of 1904, and out of eighty authors the names of Mommsen, Borghesi, Lenormant and Garrucci alone are familiar to classical students in other fields!

This is a serious indictment of classical philologists, but such are the facts and the indictment must stand. Of late, things seem to be mending somewhat. The results of research in Roman coins are at last being incorporated in the body of classical lore. The only wonder is that—boycotted as it practically has been in every university aula—Roman numismatics should still have been placed on such a firm and scientific footing, thanks to the labors of such *non-professional* scholars as the Baron d'Ailly, Gnechi, Bahrfeldt and Dr. Haeberlin. It seems indeed as if this most illuminating branch of historical study were at last "coming into its own". Courses are offered in several universities abroad (last year a course was given in the University of Rome by Dr. Lorenzina Cesano—an Italian *woman*, be it noted), and a beginning is being made in America, too. Even without the original material for study much can be done; but coins of undoubted genuineness are so readily obtainable and at such slight expense—where great rarities are not sought *as such*, and the rarity of a coin is a mere accident of no consequence from the scientific standpoint—that there is no reason why every institution where the Classics are taught should not have a small and well-selected collection as part of its equipment.

Yale has had for years a collection of several thousand specimens, both Greek and Roman, long ago catalogued with loving care by Dr. Jonathan Edwards, but since his time they have been hidden away like a buried treasure in the library, where, so far as I am aware, no one has ever used them for practical study until very recently. There are goodly collections in the Mint at Philadelphia (where the curator, Dr. T. L. Comparette, is doing what he can, under wretched conditions, to augment it), at the

Boston Museum of Fine Arts and the Metropolitan (in both of which, however, the coin is regarded as an individual work of ancient art; its historical value for comparative study is minimized), and in the American Numismatic Society's building in New York. A careful but summary catalogue of the Roman coins in St. John's College, Toledo, Ohio, was published two years ago by Father F. J. Hillig, S. J., of that institution. Thus it is evident that material exists among us and that interest in the subject is not lacking.

The little pamphlet of Professor Dunn cited at the head of this article is a welcome sign of this awakening interest, and I heartily commend a perusal of it to all who may have a curiosity to know what coins have to teach. Doubtless copies may readily be obtained by addressing the author at Eugene, Oregon. It is not presented as a work of originality or scholarship, and does not require a critical review at my hands. Professor Dunn had never given attention to Roman coins until chance placed in his way a small collection of coppers from Augustus to the fourth century, with a few earlier and later pieces. They were of little value commercially and mainly in rather bad preservation, to judge by the examples he illustrates in two plates, and further he was hampered by the lack of books to consult on the subject. But in order to show how much pleasure and profit may be drawn from even so slight a source, I cannot do better than to quote, in part, his own words in the opening section.

A privilege enjoyed by comparatively few classical instructors fell to my lot some three years ago, when, through the generosity of a friend, a collection of old coins was placed in my hands for the purpose of classification. The summers since then, and many long winter evenings, have found me poring, like a veritable miser, over my treasure-trove, thoroughly enjoying the thrill of handling these relics of antiquity and fascinated by the quest to decipher their enigmas. . . . It was a matter of progressive amazement to me to discover how a single coin could reveal such alluring glimpses into so many departments at once. One brass of Trajan's could teach me truths that had hitherto made but slight impression—I was a pupil in history, biography, current events, private life, religion, art, portraiture, epigraphy, orthography, metallurgy—all in one. . . . I am convinced that the science of ancient numismatics is an unclasped volume to the average citizen and that its technical phrases are more or less vague even to the majority of classical students. . . . May I hope that the general reader, as well perhaps as my colleagues in the classics, may find something of interest in the following paper. I am making bold to give to my pamphlet the nature of a discursus upon a selected group of the coins, indulging freely in the use of explanations and transcriptions, in the wish that I may thereby lead my readers by the same inductive method which I myself was compelled to follow.

The coins selected for examination are all *sestertii*, *dupondii* and *asses* of Divus Augustus (struck by Tiberius), Caligula (in honor of his father Ger-

manicus), Nero (temple of Janus closed), Titus, Domitian (by a slip labeled *Domitian*, p. 16), and Trajan. Would that a copy might be placed, as a 'tract', in the hands of every Latin teacher in America!

GEORGE N. OLCOTT.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Heracleitos von Ephesos, griechisch u. deutsch. Von Hermann Diels. Second Edition. Berlin: Weidmann (1909).

It is eight years since the first edition of this book appeared in 56 pages; the present numbers 83. The type is now larger and not so solid; the pages are no longer black with erudition, and the tentative pamphlet has become a little book. But this is not the sole improvement: the introduction is fuller; original sources on the life, writings and teachings of Heracleitos precede the fragments; these latter, too, are a trifle more numerous (with numbering unchanged, however), and the accompanying footnotes are generously enlarged; finally, the whole of Hippocrates' *De victu* 1.3-24 is given (this is founded on the teachings of Heracleitos, only 13-24 now being queried as pseudo-Hippocratean). Evidently, one feels, both the man and his teaching are becoming better understood, more appreciated and of increased importance.

And this is true. Twenty-five years ago Diels was not full professor in Berlin; but his lectures on Aristotle already revealed him as the coming compiler and interpreter of Greek philosophy. Since then he has given us the *Doxographi Graeci*, the fragments of the pre-Socratic philosophers, and a host of symbola on almost all of them, keeping pace with Bywater in England. In the last ten years Heracleitos has come to be a most important figure in the history of philosophy and theology through the new interpretation given to his word *logos* (an advance with which Diels shows himself not to be in full sympathy in this last edition) and our insight into his hierophantic rhetoric has been immensely enhanced by the careful arrangement of the philosopher's fragments by Diels, differing, however, greatly from Bywater's. We can now by induction and definition see the Fire.

In a vague way the world knows him as the 'Weeping Philosopher,' that he held that all things are Fire because Fire is transformed into all things, and taught a theory of Perpetual Flux, "the whole universe being possibly a speck upon the eternal ocean of change." But the skilful arrangement by Professor Diels suggests a fuller and better understanding. He has no purpose of interpreting the philosophy of Heracleitos as a whole; he has translated throughout each and every fragment of Heracleitos; others may build what system they can upon them. Logos to him is no clear parent, as he finds it in Heracleitos, of the Stoic and Philonic and evangelistic Logos, 'Word'. It is still 'welt-gesetz' or 'gesetz',